Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Original) A method for evaluating a plurality of options comprising the steps of:

a) selecting and accessing type 1 databases, DB^1_i, each of said selected databases DB^1_i including at least one option rating, $OR_i(x,n)$, for one of said options, x, with respect to a dimension n, where said option x can differ among said selected databases;

b) selecting and accessing type 2 databases DB^2_j, each of said type 2 databases DB^2_j including at least one database rating $DR_j(i)$ for at least one of said databases DB^1_i;

c) associating weights, W_i with said databases DB^1_i, said weights W_i being calculated as a function of said database ratings $DR_j(i)$; and

d) calculating an overall rating R(m,n) for an option m with respect to said dimension n as a function of said weights W_i and option ratings $OR_i(m,n)$;

e) repeating step d for each remaining one of said options for which there exists at least one option rating with respect to said dimension n; and

f) generating a list of said options and associated overall ratings with respect to dimension n.

2. (Original) A method as described in claim 1 where said function of said weights W_i and said option ratings $OR_i(m,n)$ is:

$R(m,n) = \sum_i(W_i \bullet Norm(OR_i(m,n))/ \sum_i W_i$;

a) where $Norm(OR_i(m,n)$ is a normalization of said option ratings $OR_i(m,n)$, and

b) summation $\sum_i$ ranges over all of said type 1 databases DB^1_i for which said option ratings $OR_i(m,n)$ are defined.

3. (Original) A method as described in claim 2 where said option ratings $OR_i(m,n)$ are normalized with respect to a maximum rating $OR_i(max)$ and a minimum satisfactory rating $OR_i(sat)$ for each of said selected type 1 databases DB^1_i.

4. (Original) A method as described in claim 2 where, if said option rating $OR_i(m,n)$ is less than said minimum satisfactory $OR_i(sat)$, said normalization, $Norm(OR_i(m,n))$ is set equal to a predetermined value; said predetermined value being less than a normalized minimum satisfactory rating $Norm(OR_i(sat))$.

5. (Original) A method as described in claim 2 where said function of said database ratings $DR_j(i)$ is:

$$W_i = \sum_j(MW_j \bullet Norm(DR_j(i))/ \sum_j MW_j;$$

a) where $Norm(DR_j(i))$ is a normalization of said database ratings $DR_j(i)$, and

b) summation $\sum_j$ ranges over all of said type 2 databases DB^2_j for which said option ratings $DR_j(i)$ are defined; and

c) MW_j are master weights associated with said type 2 databases DB^2_j.

6. (Original) A method as described in claim 5 where said database ratings DR^2_j are normalized with respect to a maximum rating $DR_j(max)$ and a minimum satisfactory rating $DR_j(sat)$ for each of said selected type 2 databases DB^2_j.

7. (Original) A method as described in claim 6 where, if one of said weights W_i is less than 0, said one weight is set equal to 0.

8. (Original) A method as described in claim 5 further comprising the step of adjusting said master weights MW_j based on a user's evaluation of said list.

9. (Original) A method as described in claim 8 where said adjusting step comprises the steps of:

a) said user identifying a selected choice m';

b) calculating a partial derivative $P(MW_j') = \partial Fm',n'(MW_j)/ \partial MW_j'$; where Fm'n'(MWj) is the deviation of option rating R(m',n) from the mean rating, $\Sigma_m R(m,n)/M$ as a function of master weights MW_j, where M is the total number of options for which R(m,n') is defined;

c) setting $MW_j' = MW_j'(1 + \alpha P(MW_j'))$, where α is a small positive number; and

d) repeating steps b and c for all remaining master weights MW_j.

10. (Original) A method as described in claim 8 where said adjusting step comprises the steps of:

a) said user identifying a selected choice m';

b) calculating a partial derivative $P(MW_j') = \partial Fm',n'(MW_j)/ \partial MW_j'$; where $Fm'n'(MW_j)$ is the deviation of option rating R(m',n) from the maximum rating, max(R(m,n)) as a function of master weights MW_j;

c) setting $MW_j' = MW_j'(1 + \alpha P(MW_j'))$, where α is a small positive number; and

d) repeating steps b and c for all remaining master weights MW_j.

11. (Original) A method as described in claim 1 where said options are rated with respect to a plurality of dimensions, comprising the further step of repeating steps d and e for each remaining one of said dimensions.

12. (Original) A method as described in claim 11 further comprising the step of adjusting said master weights MW_j based on a user's evaluation of said list.

13. (Original) A method as described in claim 12 where said adjusting step comprises the steps of:

a) said user identifying a selected choice m' and a critical dimension n';

b) calculating a partial derivative $P(MW_j') = \partial Fm',n'(MW_j)/ \partial MW_j'$; where $Fm',n'(MW_j)$is the deviation of option rating R(m',n') from the mean rating, $\Sigma_m R(m,n')/M$, along said

critical dimension n', as a function of master weights MW_j, where M is the total number of options for which R(m,n') is defined;

c) setting $MW_j' = MW_j'(1 + \alpha P(MW_j'))$, where α is a small positive number; and

d) repeating steps b and c for all remaining master weights MW_j.

14. (Original) A method as described in claim 12 where said adjusting step comprises the steps of:

a) said user identifying a selected choice m';

b) calculating a partial derivative $P(MW_j') = \partial Fm',n'(MW_j)/ \partial MW_j'$; where $Fm'n'(MW_j)$ is the deviation of option rating R(m',n) from the maximum rating, max(R(m,n)) as a function of master weights MW_j;

c) setting $MW_j' = MW_j'(1 + \alpha P(MW_j'))$, where α is a small positive number; and

d) repeating steps b and c for all remaining master weights MW_j.

15. (Cancelled)

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Cancelled)

18. (Cancelled)

19. (Cancelled)

20. (Cancelled)

21. (Cancelled)

22. (Cancelled)

23. (Cancelled)

24. (Canceled)

25. (Cancelled)

26. (Cancelled)

27. (Cancelled)

28. (Cancelled)

29. (Cancelled)